26th September 1956]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : The Hon. the Finance Minister said that he would be making a statement to-day.

III.—STATEMENT *RE* MADRAS-ANDHRA BORDER ISSUE.

MR. SPEAKER : The Hon. the Finance Minister said yesterday that he would make a statement. He will now make his statement.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government have considered this issue very carefully and the position and the stand taken by this Government have been fully and clearly stated on the floor of this House. The Government are also very anxious that this border dispute should be settled as early as possible and this border dispute should not be tacked on with the other border disputes arising out of the general re-organization of the States as a result of the States Reorganization Commission's Report. These matters have been made clear to the Government of India and we are expecting a reply from the Government of India at least elucidating the point that this Andhra-Madras border dispute has nothing to do with the other disputes arising out of the general reorganization of the States. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is necessary for any agitation being carried on in this matter, particularly by persons coming from neighbouring States. I find from the papers—and I hope it is correct—that most of the persons participating in the Satyagraha have come from the neighbouring State, i.e., from the disputed area. It is rather unfortunate that they should have been misled and they should have been asked to go over here to carry on this agitation in Madras where such an agitation is absolutely unnecessary and, as I have already said, meaningless. I stick to that word " meaningless ", because Satyagraha is after all intended to convert somebody to your own point of view and when we ourselves are of the same point of view, there is no meaning in carrying on Satyagraha. It was also said that the leader of this agitation Mr. Gramaniar proposed to burn a letter of the Prime Minister written to him. He still feels that he is right in taking up that attitude. He has desisted from burning that letter, because some persons have requested him not to do that—not that he has been convinced about it. Such an 10-10 attitude is rather regrettable. I hope that that attitude will change. p.m. After all, the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister of India. He represents the whole of India and any affront to the dignity of his office will be an affront to the dignity of the nation itself. Therefore I hope that such an attitude will not be taken. But that has nothing to do with the problem itself on which there is no difference of opinion. I can understand this agitation going on if there is any difference of opinion with reference to any of the questions arising in this matter. On the other hand, there is identity of opinion. The only question is to move the Government of India to appoint a boundary commission or to ask the Andhra Government to change their attitude with reference to this. Under these circumstances, the satyagraha looks as if it is intended only to embarrass the Madras Government without achieving any purpose whatsoever.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [26th September 1956

By embarrassing the Madras Government, one is not going to solve the problem. Therefore I would appeal particularly to those friends who have come over here from the neighbouring State to desist from carrying on the agitation and also to withdraw the agitation.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that a delegation might wait upon the Home Minister or any other Minister in the Central Government for the purpose of impressing upon him the necessity to solve this question immediately. We ourselves have written to the Government of India and have impressed upon them that this is an urgent matter which should be solved as early as possible. But if any results can be achieved by anybody waiting in deputation, we do not want to stand in his way. It is open to any of the parties to wait in deputation on the Government of India. As a Government we have only to say that we have already written to the Government of India and impressed upon them the necessity for solving this problem as early as possible. If any party wishes to go to the Government of India, certainly the Government cannot stand in its way and I wish it all success. If only it will be able to solve the problem, we will be only too glad about it. As far as that is concerned, this is the attitude of the Government.

I wish to make it quite clear that there is absolutely no question of our recognizing the importance of the question of the border dispute and also of its requiring very early settlement, and that has been made quite clear to the Government of India. Under these circumstances, I hope and trust and, if our appeal would have any effect, I would appeal to them in all earnestness to give up this agitation which would be only embarassing the Madras Government and which would not achieve any purpose whatsoever.

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS CULTIVATING TENANTS (PAYMENT OF FAIR RENT) BILL, 1956 (L.A. BILL NO. 4 OF 1956)—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER : We will take up the clause by clause discussion of the Bill. We will first take up clause 2. Those Members who have given notice of amendments to this clause will move them.

Clause 2.

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMY AYYANGAR : Sir, I move—

"(i) In sub-clause (1) (*b*), for the words 'cultivating tenant' occurring in line 21, *substitute* the words 'cultivating tenant in respect of any land'."

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Sir, I move—

"(ii) *Add* at the end of sub-clause (1) (*b*), the following :—

'every cultivating tenancy shall be in writing and shall be registered. (The rights of the cultivating tenants are hereditary.)'"

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : I second the amendment.